

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Amendments.

5

It is submitted that all the requested amendments can properly be made at this stage, since they are made in order to meet the objections and rejections made by the Examiner, or relate to simple corrections or changes which do not raise any new issues for consideration and/or place the application in better condition for any appeal that may be necessary.

10

Insofar as the requested amendments restrict the scope of claims or of the disclosure, they have been made in the interests of speedy prosecution, and without prejudice to Applicant's right prosecute one or more continuing applications containing broader claims and/or less restricted disclosure.

15

Amendments to the Specification

24 and 25. The amendment requested in paragraph 10 of the previous Reply has been replaced by the new amendment set out in paragraph 25. The new amendment does not refer to a blend of PVDF and the VDF copolymer, and the acetone bath test procedure has been corrected, as discussed in paragraphs (D) and (E) above.

20

26. The amendment requested in paragraph 11 of the previous Reply has been canceled in view of the Examiner's objection.

25

27. The amendment requested in paragraph 14 of the previous Reply has been canceled in view of the Examiner's objection.

30

28 and 29. The amendment requested in paragraph 16 of the previous Reply has been replaced by the new amendment set out in paragraph 29. The new amendment does not refer to non-polymeric components, but retains the references to "antioxidants, pigments, fillers, flame retardants etc., as optional ingredients for both layers (i) and (ii), as discussed in paragraphs (A) and (K) above.

30 and 31. The amendment requested in paragraph 19 of the previous Reply has been canceled and replaced by the new amendment set out in paragraph 30. The new amendment contains the corrected acetone bath test procedure, as discussed in paragraph (E) above.

5 The Amendments to the Claims

Claim 28.

Claim 28 has been amended to remove the references to non-polymeric components, to specify that the carbonyl-containing polymer has a non-aromatic backbone, and to remove the
10 references to blends of PVDF and the VDF copolymer, as discussed in paragraphs (A), (B) and (D) above. However, the reference to a metallic conductor has been maintained, as discussed in paragraph (C) above.

Claim 29

15 A typographical error has been corrected.

Claims 30, 39 and 49

The acetone bath test procedure has been corrected, as discussed in paragraph (E) above.

20 Claim 31

The reference to "polyolefins" has been changed to "polyethylene", as discussed in paragraph (F) above.

Claim 35

25 The reference to blends of PVDF and the VDF copolymer has been removed, as discussed in paragraph (D) above.

Claim 36

The reference to non-polymeric components has been removed, but the presence of the specified additives in at least one of the layers has been retained, as discussed in paragraphs (A) and (K) above.

5

Claim 37.

The references to non-polymeric components and to blends of PVDF and the VDF polymer have been removed (the claim already specified that the carbonyl-containing polymer had a non-aromatic backbone), as discussed in paragraphs (A), (B) and (D) above.

10

Claim 40

The nomenclature of the polymeric composition in the layer (i) has been corrected.

Claim 47

15

The references to non-polymeric components have been removed (the claim already specified that the carbonyl-containing polymer had a non-aromatic backbone and required the use of a specific VDF copolymer), as discussed in paragraphs (A), (B) and (D) above.

Claim 51

20

Claim 51. has been amended to remove the references to non-polymeric components, to specify that the carbonyl-containing polymer has a non-aromatic backbone, and to remove the references to blends of PVDF and the VDF copolymer, as discussed in paragraphs (A), (B) and (D) above. In addition, claim 51 has been amended by replacing "an electrical conductor" by "a metallic conductor", for consistency with the other claims.

25

The New Matter Objections

It is believed to be clear, having regard to the requested amendments and the explanations already given, that the new matter objections should be withdrawn.

30

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections under 35 USC 112, insofar as they are applicable to the amended claims, for the reasons set out above.

5

CONCLUSION

It is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance, and Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If, however, there are any outstanding issues that could usefully be discussed by telephone, the Examiner is asked to call the undersigned.

10

Respectfully submitted,



T.H.P. Richardson

Reg. No. 28805

650-854-6304

15